Nos. 14-556, 14-562, 14-571, 14-574

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

JAMES OBERGEFELL, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD HODGES, DIRECTOR, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE KENNETH B. MEHLMAN ET AL. SUPPORTING PETITIONERS

SEAN R. GALLAGHER
STACY A. CARPENTER
BENNETT L. COHEN
POLSINELLI PC
1515 Wynkoop Street
Suite 600
Denver, CO 80202

REGINALD J. BROWN
SETH P. WAXMAN
Counsel of Record
PAUL R.Q. WOLFSON
DINA B. MISHRA
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000
seth.waxman@wilmerhale.com

ADDITIONAL CAPTIONS AND COUNSEL LISTED ON INSIDE COVER

BRITTANI HENRY, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,

v.

RICHARD HODGES, DIRECTOR, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, *et al.*, *Respondents*.

VALERIA TANCO, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,

v.

WILLIAM EDWARD "BILL" HASLAM, *et al.*, *Respondents*.

APRIL DEBOER, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,

v.

RICHARD SNYDER, *et al.*, *Respondents*.

GREGORY BOURKE, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,

v.

STEVE BESHEAR, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY, *Respondent*.

MARK C. FLEMING
FELICIA H. ELLSWORTH
ELISABETH M. OPPENHEIMER
ALLISON TRZOP
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

ALAN E. SCHOENFELD
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

ARGUMENT 6

I. EQUAL ACCESS TO CIVIL MARRIAGE PROMOTES THE CONSERVATIVE VALUES OF STABILITY, MUTUAL SUPPORT, AND MUTUAL OBLIGATION 6

II. THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT REQUIRES EQUAL ACCESS TO CIVIL MARRIAGE BECAUSE THERE IS NO LEGITIMATE, FACT-BASED JUSTIFICATION FOR GOVERNMENT TO EXCLUDE SAME-SEX COUPLES IN COMMITTED RELATIONSHIPS 13

A. The Facts Do Not Support Any Of The Putative Rationales For Marriage Bans 16

B. Even If The Marriage Bans Were Based On Concerns For Tradition And Caution In The Face Of Societal Change, That Does Not Sustain Their Constitutionality 23

III. THIS COURT SHOULD ENSURE THAT GOVERNMENTS DO NOT DENY THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIVIL MARRIAGE TO SAME-SEX COUPLES 27

CONCLUSION 32

APPENDIX: List of Amici Curiae 1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Page(s)

Board of Trustees of University of Alabama v. *Garrett*, 531 U.S. 356 (2001) 14

Boddie v. *Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971) 8

Bourke v. *Beshear*, 996 F. Supp. 2d 542 (W.D. Ky. 2014) 12, 25

Brown v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) 24

Buckley v. *Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976) 31

Citizens United v. *FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010) 30

City of Cleburne v. *Cleburne Living Center*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985) 30

Craig v. *Boren*, 429 U.S. 190 (1976) 23

DeBoer v. *Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014) ..... *passim*

DeBoer v. *Snyder*, 973 F. Supp. 2d 757 (E.D. Mich. 2014) 9, 14, 19, 20, 23, 25

Department of Agriculture v. *Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528 (1973) 14

District of Columbia v. *Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008) 27, 31

F.S. Royster Guano Co. v. *Virginia*, 253 U.S. 412 (1920) 14

First National Bank of Boston v. *Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765 (1978) 31

Golinski v. *OPM*, 824 F. Supp. 2d 968 (N.D. Cal. 2012) 12, 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Hall v. *Florida*, 134 S. Ct. 1986 (2014) 27

Hamby v. *Parnell*, No. 14-089, 2014 WL 5089399 (D. Alaska Oct. 12, 2014) 15, 20

Heller v. *Doe*, 509 U.S. 312 (1993) 14, 25

Hollingsworth v. *Perry*, 133 S. Ct. 2652 (2013) 3

Hunter v. *Erickson*, 393 U.S. 385 (1969) 26

Kitchen v. *Herbert*, 755 F.3d 1193 (10th Cir. 2014) 17

Kitchen v. *Herbert*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 1181 (D. Utah 2013) 27

Lamb's Chapel v. *Center Moriches Union Free School District*, 508 U.S. 384 (1993) 31

Louisville Gas & Electric Co. v. *Coleman*, 277 U.S. 32 (1928) 14

Love v. *Beshear*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 536 (W.D. Ky. 2014) 15, 17

Loving v. *Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967) 7, 8, 9, 30

Lucas v. *Forty-Fourth General Assembly of Colorado*, 377 U.S. 713 (1964) 28

M.L.B. v. *S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102 (1996) 8

Maynard v. *Hill*, 125 U.S. 190 (1888) 7

McDonald v. *City of Chicago*, 561 U.S. 742 (2010) 29

Meyer v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) 8

Miller-El v. *Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322 (2003) 27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

New York State Club Ass'n v. *City of New York*, 487 U.S. 1 (1988) 14

New York Times v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964) 31

Palmore v. *Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429 (1984) 24

Perry v. *Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010) 9, 20, 25

Pierce v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925) 8

Schuette v. *Coalition To Defend Affirmative Action*, 134 S. Ct. 1623 (2014) 28, 29

Searcy v. *Strange*, No. 14-208, 2015 WL 328728 (S.D. Ala. Jan. 23, 2015) 15

Skinner v. *Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U.S. 535 (1942) 8

Stanton v. *Stanton*, 421 U.S. 7 (1975) 23

Taylor v. *Louisiana*, 419 U.S. 522 (1975) 24

Trammel v. *United States*, 445 U.S. 40 (1980) 24

Turner v. *Safley*, 482 U.S. 78 (1987) 8

United States v. *Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549 (1995) 28

United States v. *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013) ..... *passim*

Watson v. *City of Memphis*, 373 U.S. 526 (1963) 26

West Virginia State Board of Education v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) 30

Widmar v. *Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981) 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Williams v. *Illinois*, 399 U.S. 235 (1970) 25

Windsor v. *United States*, 699 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 2012) 21

Wisconsin v. *Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972) 31

Zablocki v. *Redhail*, 434 U.S. 374 (1978) 6, 8

DOCKETED CASES

Loving v. *Virginia*, Appellee Brief, 388 U.S. 1 (1967) (No. 66-395) 30

Perry v. *Schwarzenegger*, Transcript, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (No. 09-2292) 8

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Ala. Const. art. I, §3.01 5

Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§41-1493 to -1493.02 5

Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. §52-571b 5

D.C. Code §46-406(e) 5

Fla. Stat. Ann. §§761.01-.05 5

Idaho Code Ann. §§73-401 to -404 5

775 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 35/1-/99 5

Kan. Stat. Ann. §§60-5301 to -5305 5

Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §446.350 5

La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§13:5231-:5242 5

Md. Const., Declaration of Rights art. 36 5

Miss. Code Ann. §11-61-1 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Mo. Ann. Stat. §§1.302-.307 5

N.M. Stat. §§28-22-1 to -5 5

Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 51, §§251-258 5

71 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. §§2401-2407 5

Pa. Const. art. 1, §3 5

R.I. Gen. Laws §§42-80.1-1 to -4 5

S.C. Code Ann. §§1-32-10 to -60 5

Tenn. Code Ann. §4-1-407 5

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code. Ann. §§110.001-.012 5

Utah Code Ann. §§63L-5-101 to -403 5

Va. Code Ann. §§57-1 to -2.02 5

Va. Const. art. 1, §16 5

OTHER AUTHORITIES

2 Burke, Edmund, *The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke* (Bell ed. 1892) 25

Cameron, David, Address to the Conservative Party Conference (Oct. 5, 2011), *available at* http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-15189614 13

Cherlin, Andrew J., *American Marriage in the Early Twenty-First Century*, in 15 *The Future of Children* 33 (2005) 10

Chernow, Ron, *Washington: A Life* (2010) 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Choper, Jesse H. & John C. Yoo, *Can the Government Prohibit Gay Marriage?*, 50 S. Tex. L. Rev. 15 (2008) 11, 22

2 de Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America* (Henry Reeve trans., Saunders & Otley 1835) 7

Farr, Rachel H., et al., *Parenting and Child Development in Adoptive Families: Does Parental Sexual Orientation Matter?*, 14 Applied Developmental Sci. 164 (2010) 20

Federalist No. 78 (Hamilton) (Jacob E. Cooke ed., 1961) 29

Gates, Gary J., *LGBT Parenting in the United States* (Feb. 2013), *available at* http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9xs6g8xx 11

Goldberg, Abbie E. & JuliAnna Z. Smith, *Predictors of Psychological Adjustment in Early Placed Adopted Children With Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Parents*, 27 J. Family Psychol. 431 (2013) 21

Goldwater, Barry, *The Conscience of a Conservative* (1960) 31

Goldwater, Barry, Speech at the Republican National Convention (July 16, 1964), *available at* http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/daily/may98/goldwaterspeech.htm 3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Institute for American Values, *When Marriage Disappears: The New Middle America* (2010) 10

Lavner, Justin A., et al., *Can Gay and Lesbian Parents Promote Healthy Development in High-Risk Children Adopted From Foster Care?*, 82 Am. J. Orthopsychiatry 465 (2012) 21

Madison, James, Speech in Congress on the Removal Power (June 8, 1789), in 1 *Annals of Cong.* 448 (Joseph Gales ed., 1790) 29

Perrin, Ellen C., et al., *Technical Report: Coparent or Second-Parent Adoption by Same-Sex Parents*, 109 Pediatrics 341 (2002) 20

Supreme Court Rule 37.6 1

van Gelderen, Loes, et al., *Quality of Life of Adolescents Raised From Birth by Lesbian Mothers: The US National Longitudinal Family Study*, 33 J. Developmental & Behav. Pediatrics 17 (2012) 21

5 *The Writings of James Madison: 1787-1790* (Gaillard Hunt ed., 1904) 28

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE[1]

Amici are social and political conservatives, moderates, and libertarians from diverse backgrounds. Many have served as elected or appointed officeholders in various Presidential administrations, as governors, mayors, and other officeholders in States and cities across the Nation, as members of Congress, as ambassadors, as military officers, as officials in political campaigns and political parties, and as advocates and activists for various political and social causes. Amici support traditional conservative values, including the belief in the importance of stable families, as well as the commitment to limited government and the protection of individual freedom. Because they believe that those conservative values are consistent with—indeed, are advanced by—affording civil marriage rights to same-sex couples, amici submit that the decision below should be reversed.

A full list of amici is provided as an Appendix to this brief.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In 2013, this Court struck down the federal Defense of Marriage Act ("DOMA"), concluding that the law—which refused to honor for federal purposes the marriages of same-sex couples validly married under State law—violated the core promises of the United States

---

[1] By letters on file with the Clerk, all parties have consented to the filing of this brief. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 37.6, amici state that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part; no counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief; and no person—other than amici or their counsel—made such a monetary contribution.

Constitution. *See United States* v. *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013). The Court in *Windsor* recognized that the "[r]esponsibilities" attendant to marriage, "as well as [the] rights, enhance the dignity and integrity of the person." *Id.* at 2694. The Court therefore held that a law treating same-sex couples differently from others by withholding those rights and responsibilities "demeans" same-sex couples, "impose[s] inequality" and "a stigma" on them, denies them "equal dignity," treats them as "unworthy," and "humiliates" and makes vulnerable their children. *Id.* at 2693-2694. Those children, the Court explained, should not be "instruct[ed]" that the marriage of the parents who provide for and raise them "is less worthy"—and neither they nor their parents should suffer from the law's placement of "same-sex couples in an unstable position" of having "second-tier" relationships. *Id.* at 2694, 2696. Thus, this Court rejected a law that would "restrict the freedom" of those couples and infringe "the liberty of the person" by "impos[ing] a disability on the class"—by "disparag[ing]" and "injur[ing]" a set of individuals entitled to "personhood and dignity." *Id.* at 2693, 2695-2696.

Although amici hold a broad spectrum of socially and politically conservative, moderate, and libertarian views, amici share the view that laws that bar same-sex couples from the institution of civil marriage, with all its attendant profoundly important rights and responsibilities, are inconsistent with the United States Constitution's dual promises of equal protection and due process. The marriage bans challenged here, like the act at issue in *Windsor*, target gay and lesbian couples and their families for injurious governmental treatment. The bans are accordingly inconsistent with amici's understanding of the properly limited role of government. Rather, amici embrace Barry Goldwater's

expression of that understanding, namely that "[w]e do not seek to lead anyone's life for him—we seek only to secure his rights and to guarantee him opportunity to strive, with government performing only those needed and constitutionally sanctioned tasks which cannot otherwise be performed."[2]

Amici further believe that when the government *does* act in ways that affect individual freedom in matters of family and child-rearing, it should promote family-supportive values like responsibility, fidelity, commitment, and stability. Much has been written about the deleterious impact of family breakdown in our Nation today. There is a need for more Americans to choose to participate in the institution of marriage. Yet these bans, by denying each member of an entire class of American citizens the right to marry the person he or she loves, discourage those important family values. They discourage responsibility, fidelity, and commitment. And they harm children, denying them and their loving parents the basic legal protections that provide stability and security so critical to child-rearing.

Many of the signatories to this brief previously did not support civil marriage for same-sex couples; others did not hold a position on the issue until recently. The list of signatories to this brief overlaps with, but also extends beyond, those who joined a similar brief in *Hollingsworth* v. *Perry*, 133 S. Ct. 2652 (2013), likewise supporting there the couples challenging California's marriage-restrictive Proposition 8. As civil marriage has become a reality for same-sex couples in 36 States and the District of Columbia, amici, like many Ameri-

---

[2] Goldwater, Speech at the Republican National Convention (July 16, 1964), *available at* http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/daily/may98/goldwaterspeech.htm.

cans, have considered the results, reexamined their own positions, and concluded that there is no legitimate, fact-based reason for denying same-sex couples the same recognition in law that is available to opposite-sex couples. Rather, amici have concluded that marriage is strengthened, and its value to society and to individual families and couples is promoted, by providing access to civil marriage for all American couples—heterosexual or gay or lesbian alike. In particular, civil marriage provides stability for the children of same-sex couples, the value of which cannot be overestimated. In light of these conclusions, amici believe that the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits States from denying same-sex couples the legal rights and responsibilities that flow from the institution of civil marriage. This is especially true where, as here, the validity of thousands of existing marriages of same-sex couples could be thrown into doubt by a contrary ruling. Indeed, amici's concern for the stability of existing and future families is particularly heightened in this context.

Amici acknowledge that deeply held social, cultural, and religious tenets may lead sincere and fair-minded people to take the opposite view. But no matter how strong, sincere, or longstanding these views, they cannot, under our constitutional system, serve as the basis for denying this class of people access to the institution of civil marriage in the absence of a legitimate, fact-based governmental goal. Amici take this position with the understanding that requiring access to *civil* marriage for same-sex couples—which is the only issue raised in these cases—need not pose any threat to religious freedom or to the institution of religious marriage. Amici believe firmly that religious individuals and organizations should, and will, express their own views and make their own decisions about whether and

how to participate in marriages between persons of the same sex, and that the government should not intervene in those decisions—just as it must not intervene in these couples' decisions to participate in the institution of civil marriage.[3]

---

[3] Amici support the free exercise of religion, and have the deepest respect for those who defend it. Given the robust federal and State protections for the free exercise of religion, however, amici do not believe that access to civil marriage for same-sex couples should pose a threat to religious freedom. Amici note, for instance, that many States have expansive constitutional protections for religious liberty. *See, e.g.*, Pa. Const. art. 1, §3 ("no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience"); Md. Const., Declaration of Rights art. 36; Va. Const. art. 1, §16. And numerous States have enacted statutes designed to ensure religious liberty, both generally and in connection with access to civil marriage for same-sex couples. *See, e.g.*, Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §446.350 (the government may not burden a person's exercise of religion except through the least restrictive means available, and for a compelling purpose); D.C. Code §46-406(e) (religious societies or nonprofit organizations controlled by religious societies are not required to provide services or accommodations related to the celebration of any marriage, or to promote any marriage through its programs, counseling, or retreats); *see also* Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. §52-571b; R.I. Gen. Laws §§42-80.1-1 to -4; 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 35/1-/99; Fla. Stat. Ann. §§761.01-.05; Ala. Const. art. I, §3.01; Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§41-1493 to 1493.02; S.C. Code Ann. §§1-32-10 to -60; Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code. Ann. §§110.001-.012; Idaho Code Ann. §§73-401 to -404; N.M. Stat. §§28-22-1 to -5; Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 51, §§251-258; 71 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. §§2401-2407; Mo. Ann. Stat. §§1.302-.307; Va. Code Ann. §§57-1 to -2.02; Utah Code Ann. §§63L-5-101 to -403; Tenn. Code Ann. §4-1-407; La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§13:5231-:5242; Kan. Stat. Ann. §§60-5301 to -5305 (2013); Miss. Code Ann. §11-61-1. These laws, as well as the protections afforded by the First Amendment, reflect our Nation's commitment to the accommodation of diverse perspectives. In a tolerant society, the right to marry can and should coexist with the right to disagree respectfully and to decline to participate as individuals based on sincerely held religious beliefs.

Amici believe strongly in the principle of judicial restraint, under which courts generally defer to legislatures and the electorate on matters of social policy. Amici also believe that courts should not rush to invoke the Constitution to remove issues from the normal democratic process. But amici equally believe that actions by legislatures and popular majorities can on occasion pose significant threats to individual freedom and that, when they do, courts have the power to—and should—intervene. Our constitutional tradition empowers and requires the judiciary to protect our most cherished liberties against overreaching by the government, including overreach through an act of the legislature or electorate. That principle, no less than our commitment to democratic self-government, is necessary to individual freedom and limited government. It is precisely at moments like this one—when discriminatory laws appear to reflect unexamined and unwarranted assumptions rather than facts and evidence, and the rights of one group of citizens hang in the balance—that the courts' intervention is most needed. Amici accordingly urge this Court to reverse the judgment below.

ARGUMENT

I. EQUAL ACCESS TO CIVIL MARRIAGE PROMOTES THE CONSERVATIVE VALUES OF STABILITY, MUTUAL SUPPORT, AND MUTUAL OBLIGATION

Amici start from the premise—recognized by this Court on numerous occasions—that marriage is a fundamental right protected by our Constitution and a venerable institution that confers countless other rights and responsibilities, both upon those who marry and upon society at large. *See, e.g., Zablocki* v. *Redhail*, 434 U.S. 374, 384 (1978) ("Marriage is a coming

together for better or for worse, hopefully enduring, and intimate to the degree of being sacred. It is an association that promotes a way of life, not causes; a harmony in living, not political faiths; a bilateral loyalty, not commercial or social projects. Yet it is an association for as noble a purpose as any involved in our prior decisions." (internal quotation marks omitted)). By reinforcing essential values such as commitment, faithfulness, responsibility, and sacrifice, marriage is the foundation of the secure families that form the building blocks of our communities and our Nation. *See Maynard* v. *Hill*, 125 U.S. 190, 205, 211 (1888) (marriage is "the foundation of the family and of society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress"). It both provides a protective shelter and reduces the need for reliance on the state. As a perceptive observer of American society wrote almost two centuries ago, "There is certainly no country in the world where the tie of marriage is so much respected as in America .... [W]hen the American retires from the turmoil of public life to the bosom of his family, he finds in it the image of order and of peace.... [H]e afterwards carries [that image] with him into public affairs." 2 de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* 230 (Reeve trans., Saunders & Otley 1835).

Choosing to marry is also a paradigmatic exercise of human liberty. *Loving* v. *Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 12 (1967) ("The freedom to marry has long been recognized as one of the vital personal rights essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men."). Those who have been denied the right to marry may be the most eloquent witnesses to its fundamental importance to liberty. As an expert on the history of marriage observed, "[w]hen slaves were emancipated, they

flocked to get married. And this was not trivial to them, by any means. [One] ex-slave who had also been a Union soldier ... declared, 'The marriage covenant is the foundation of all our rights.'" Transcript 202-203, *Perry* v. *Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (No. 09-2292). Moreover, the mutual dependence and obligation fostered by marriage affirmatively advance the appropriately narrow and modest role of government.

For those who choose to marry, the rights and responsibilities conveyed by civil marriage provide a bulwark against unwarranted government intervention into deeply personal concerns such as medical and child-rearing decisions. *See, e.g.*, *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510, 534-535 (1925) (affirming "the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control"); *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 401 (1923) (recognizing "the power of parents to control the education of their own"). Thus, this Court has recognized on numerous occasions that the freedom to marry is one of the fundamental liberties that an ordered society must strive to protect and promote.[4]

---

[4] *See, e.g.*, *M.L.B.* v. *S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102, 116 (1996) ("Choices about marriage, family life, and the upbringing of children are among associational rights this Court has ranked as 'of basic importance in our society,' rights sheltered by the Fourteenth Amendment against the State's unwarranted usurpation, disregard, or disrespect." (citation omitted)); *Turner* v. *Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 95 (1987) ("[T]he decision to marry is a fundamental right" and an "expression[] of emotional support and public commitment."); *Zablocki*, 434 U.S. at 384 ("[T]he right to marry is of fundamental importance for all individuals."); *Loving*, 388 U.S. at 12; *Meyer*, 262 U.S. at 399 (the right "to marry, establish a home and bring up children" is a central part of constitutionally protected liberty); *see also, e.g.*, *Boddie* v. *Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371, 376, 383 (1971)

This Court has reaffirmed that freedom by securing marriage rights for prisoners, *Turner* v. *Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 95 (1987); striking down laws requiring court permission to marry, *Zablocki*, 434 U.S. at 388; and eliminating discriminatory restrictions on the right to marry, *Loving*, 388 U.S. at 12; *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2696. "Taken together, both the *Windsor* and *Loving* decisions stand for the proposition that, without some overriding legitimate interest, the state cannot use its domestic relations authority to legislate families out of existence." *DeBoer* v. *Snyder*, 973 F. Supp. 2d 757, 774 (E.D. Mich.), *rev'd*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014).

Our national commitment to civil marriage—and this Court's recognition of its fundamental status—reflects a common understanding that those who choose to marry benefit tremendously from the stability and mutual support and obligation that the legal relationship confers. Some of these protections are concrete. *See, e.g.*, *Perry* v. *Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 962 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (married couples "fare better. They are physically healthier. They tend to live longer. They engage in fewer risky behaviors. They look better on measures of psychological well-being"). Others are yet more profound, as the legal relationship of marriage distinctly confers on couples—and their children—numerous enhancements to individual autonomy and family security.

For instance, marriage makes it immeasurably easier for family members to plan with and decide for one another. Married individuals can make medical

---

("[M]arriage involves interests of basic importance in our society" and is "a fundamental human relationship."); *Skinner* v. *Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942) (marriage is "one of the basic civil rights of man").

decisions together (or for each other if one spouse is not able to make a decision) and can make joint decisions for the upbringing of children; they can plan jointly for their financial future and their retirement; they can hold property together; they can share a spouse's medical insurance policy and have the health coverage continue for a period after a spouse's death; and they have increased protections against creditors upon the death of a spouse. Some—not all—of these rights and responsibilities can be approximated outside marriage with expensive legal assistance, but only marriage provides a family with the security that those rights and responsibilities will be automatically available when they are most needed.

Perhaps most importantly, marriage protects children. "We know, for instance, that children who grow up in intact, married families are significantly more likely to graduate from high school, finish college, become gainfully employed, and enjoy a stable family life themselves[.]" Institute for American Values, *When Marriage Disappears: The New Middle America* 52 (2010); *see also id.* at 95 ("Children who grow up with cohabiting couples tend to have more negative life outcomes compared to those growing up with married couples. Prominent reasons are that cohabiting couples have a much higher breakup rate than do married couples, a lower level of household income, and a higher level of child abuse and domestic violence." (footnote omitted)). These protections have become even more critical in recent decades, as marital rates have declined and child-rearing has become increasingly untethered to marriage. *See, e.g.*, Cherlin, *American Marriage in the Early Twenty-First Century*, in 15 *The Future of Children* 33, 35-36 (2005).

The protections that marriage offers couples and their children do not depend on whether the individuals forming the married couple are of the same or opposite sexes. Same-sex couples, just like couples composed of a man and a woman, benefit from the security and bilateral loyalty conferred by civil marriage. The same is true for the children of those couples; it is stability, not the sex of their parents, that protects them. *See infra* pp. 18-21. The salutary effects of civil marriage do not arise to any lesser degree when two women or two men lawfully marry each other than when a man and a woman marry. As Professors Jesse Choper and John Yoo—who support civil marriage for same-sex couples as a policy choice—have explained:

> With regard to gay marriage, the cost of a prohibition is the restriction of the liberty of two individuals of the same sex who seek the same legal status for an intimate relationship that is available to individuals of different sexes. This harm may not be restricted just to the individuals involved but may also involve broader social costs. If the government believes that marriage has positive benefits for society, some or all of those benefits may attach to same-sex marriages as well. Stable relationships may produce more personal income and less demands on welfare and unemployment programs; it may create the best conditions for the rearing of children; and it may encourage individuals to invest and save for the future.

Choper & Yoo, *Can the Government Prohibit Gay Marriage?*, 50 S. Tex. L. Rev. 15, 33-34 (2008).

There is no question that the hundreds of thou-thousands of children being raised by same-sex couples[5]—some married, some precluded from marrying—would be protected by the security and stability that civil marriage confers. This Court has already suggested as much. *See Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694 (recognizing that DOMA placed same-sex couples in the "unstable position" of a "second-tier" relationship that "humiliate[d]" and harmed the children being raised by those couples); *id.* at 2695 (rejecting DOMA's imposition of "financial harm [on] children of same-sex couples" by depriving their families of various marital rights and responsibilities). The denial of civil marriage to same-sex couples does not mean that their children will be raised by married opposite-sex couples. Rather, the choice here is between allowing same-sex couples to marry versus depriving their children of married parents altogether. Indeed, a decision that States may exclude same-sex couples from civil marriage might call into doubt the status of marriages that have already been lawfully recognized, legally erasing existing families—an even starker humiliation than that condemned in *Windsor*.

Courts across the country have repeatedly found "that it was the government's failure to recognize same-sex marriages that harmed children, not having married parents who happened to be of the same sex." *Bourke* v. *Beshear*, 996 F. Supp. 2d 542, 553 (W.D. Ky.), *rev'd sub nom. DeBoer* v. *Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014); *see also, e.g.*, *Golinski* v. *OPM*, 824 F. Supp. 2d 968, 992 (N.D. Cal. 2012) ("The denial of recognition and

---

[5] *See* Gates, *LGBT Parenting in the United States* 1 (Feb. 2013), *available at* http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9xs6g8xx ("More than 125,000 same-sex couple households ... include nearly 220,000 children under age 18.").

withholding of marital benefits to same-sex couples does nothing to support opposite-sex parenting, but rather merely serves to endanger children of same-sex parents[.]").

It is precisely because marriage is so important in producing and protecting strong and stable family structures that the goal of strengthening families favors civil marriage for same-sex couples. As British Prime Minister and Conservative Party Leader David Cameron explained, "Conservatives believe in the ties that bind us; that society is stronger when we make vows to each other and support each other. So I don't support gay marriage despite being a Conservative. I support gay marriage because I'm a Conservative."[6]

II. THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT REQUIRES EQUAL ACCESS TO CIVIL MARRIAGE BECAUSE THERE IS NO LEGITIMATE, FACT-BASED JUSTIFICATION FOR GOVERNMENT TO EXCLUDE SAME-SEX COUPLES IN COMMITTED RELATIONSHIPS

In *Windsor*, this Court held that DOMA was invalid because it "differentiat[ed]" same-sex couples in terms of their marital rights and responsibilities, rendering them "second-tier" and "humiliat[ing]" the children being raised by them. 133 S. Ct. at 2694. This unequal classification of citizens, the Court explained, exceeds the government's authority in light of the Constitution's guarantees of equal protection, which "withdraw[] from Government the power to degrade or demean" in that manner. *Id.* at 2695. This Court ruled that "no legitimate purpose overcomes the purpose and

---

[6] Cameron, Address to the Conservative Party Conference (Oct. 5, 2011), *available at* http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-15189614.

effect to disparage and to injure" individuals who are entitled to "personhood and dignity." *Id.* at 2696. Just as in *Windsor*, the laws in these cases have the "purpose and practical effect ... to impose a disadvantage, a separate status, and so a stigma" on same-sex couples with respect to civil marriage rights and responsibilities. *Id.* at 2693.

Laws that classify citizens and render them unequal in their access to civil rights and responsibilities raise grave constitutional questions, and at a minimum such laws must have "reasonable support in fact," *New York State Club Ass'n* v. *City of N.Y.*, 487 U.S. 1, 17 (1988), and must "operate so as rationally to further" a legitimate government goal, *Department of Agric.* v. *Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528, 537 (1973). To survive scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause, a law must at the very least be founded in the "realities" of the subject covered by that law. *Heller* v. *Doe*, 509 U.S. 312, 321 (1993) ("[E]ven the standard of rationality as we so often have defined it must find some footing in the realities of the subject addressed by the legislation."). "[C]lassification[s] must be reasonable, not arbitrary, and must rest upon some ground of difference having a fair and substantial relation to the object of the legislation, so that all persons similarly circumstanced shall be treated alike." *F.S. Royster Guano Co.* v. *Virginia*, 253 U.S. 412, 415 (1920); *see also Board of Trs. of Univ. of Ala.* v. *Garrett*, 531 U.S. 356, 367 (2001) (attitudes unsubstantiated by relevant facts are not sufficient to indicate the furtherance of a legitimate government purpose); *Louisville Gas & Elec. Co.* v. *Coleman*, 277 U.S. 32, 36-37 (1928) ("[M]ere difference is not enough; the attempted classification 'must always rest upon some

difference which bears a reasonable and just relation to the act[.]'").

Recent rulings in civil marriage cases have observed that discrimination against same-sex couples in this context cannot survive any level of review because it is not rationally related to a legitimate governmental purpose grounded in fact. *See, e.g.*, *DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 768 ("The Court finds that the [Michigan Marriage Amendment] impermissibly discriminates against same-sex couples in violation of the Equal Protection Clause because the provision does not advance any conceivable legitimate state interest."), *rev'd*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014); *Searcy* v. *Strange*, No. 14-208, 2015 WL 328728, at *5 (S.D. Ala. Jan. 23, 2015) ("If anything, Alabama's prohibition ... detracts from its goal of promoting optimal environments for children."); *Hamby* v. *Parnell*, No. 14-089, 2014 WL 5089399, at *12 (D. Alaska Oct. 12, 2014) ("Alaska's same-sex marriage laws are a prime example of how 'the varying treatment of different groups or persons is so unrelated to the achievement of any combination of legitimate purposes that we can only conclude that the legislature's actions were irrational.'"); *Love* v. *Beshear*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 536, 547 (W.D. Ky. 2014) ("Ultimately, Kentucky's laws banning same-sex marriage cannot withstand constitutional review regardless of the standard.").

Amici do not believe there is a legitimate, fact-based justification for excluding same-sex couples from civil marriage. Over the past two decades, the arguments presented by proponents of such initiatives have been discredited by social science, rejected by courts, and contradicted by amici's personal experience with same-sex couples, including those whose civil marriages have been legally performed and recognized

in various States. Amici thus do not believe that any "reasonable support in fact" exists for arguments that allowing same-sex couples to join in civil marriage will damage or distort the institution, jeopardize children, or cause any other social ills. Rather, the facts and evidence show that permitting civil marriage for same-sex couples will enhance the institution, protect children, and benefit society generally. Banning marriage for same-sex couples, in contrast, undermines these critical societal goals: Such bans impede family formation, harm children, and discourage fidelity, responsibility, and stability.

A. The Facts Do Not Support Any Of The Putative Rationales For Marriage Bans

Proponents of laws like those at issue here have advanced several arguments that they contend support the exclusion of same-sex couples from civil marriage, principally relating to the bearing and raising of children. In particular, proponents invoke (1) *a child-centric, or "conjugal," marriage culture*: the notion that allowing the marriages of same-sex couples will harm the institution of marriage by severing it from child-rearing; (2) *child welfare*: the notion that children are better off when raised by two parents of different sexes; and (3) *biology*: the notions that marriage is important only for opposite-sex couples, who may procreate accidentally, and that children are better off when raised by two biological parents. Each of these arguments reflects an unexamined preconception rather than fact and has been refuted by substantial evidence and common experience. Moreover, as this Court recognized in *Windsor*, it is the governmental *exclusion* of same-sex couples from the rights and responsibilities of civil marriage that is most injurious to hundreds of

thousands of children, as well as to the couples themthemselves.

Child-Centric, or "Conjugal," Marriage Culture. No credible evidence supports the theory that allowing access to civil marriage for same-sex couples has any adverse effect on the reality or the social perception of the institution of marriage as the optimal setting for the raising of children. To the contrary, ending the exclusion of same-sex couples from civil marriage rights would be a clear endorsement of the multiple benefits of marriage—including stability, lifetime commitment, and financial support during crisis and old age—and a reaffirmation of the social value of this institution for all committed couples and their families.[7]

Marriage has undoubtedly faced serious challenges over the last few decades, as demonstrated by high divorce rates and the greater incidence of child-bearing and child-rearing outside of marriage. Yet there is no evidence to suggest that allowing committed same-sex couples to marry has exacerbated or will in any way accelerate those trends, which have their origins in complex social forces. *See, e.g.*, *Kitchen* v. *Herbert*, 755 F.3d 1193, 1223 (10th Cir.) ("We emphatically agree with the numerous cases decided since *Windsor* that it is wholly illogical to believe that state recognition of the love and commitment between same-sex couples will alter the most intimate and personal decisions of

---

[7] A ruling that marriage bans are consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment would gravely unsettle the lives of thousands of same-sex couples who have married in States where bans have been struck down as unconstitutional. Introducing that uncertainty into these couples' marriages, and into their families' lives, would be the antithesis of reaffirming the values of stability, structure, and mutual support that underlie amici's commitment to the institution of civil marriage.

opposite-sex couples."), *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 265 (2014); *Love*, 989 F. Supp. 2d at 548 ("Excluding same-sex couples from marriage does not change the number of heterosexual couples who choose to get married, the number who choose to have children, or the number of children they have."). If anything, the way to preserve and promote the institution of civil marriage would be to encourage *more* couples to marry, not to exclude this entire category of American citizens from what this Court has called "a far-reaching legal acknowledgement of the intimate relationship between two people." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2692. Such exclusion simply limits the number of Americans who may marry and whose children and families may benefit from the institution of civil marriage.

Amici submit that this observation has only been further empirically vindicated in the two years since *Windsor*. The experience in States in which same-sex couples are no longer excluded from civil marriage has made abundantly clear that marriage serves as a valuable and foundational institution for same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples alike. Evidence has also reinforced that more harm is done to a child-centric marriage culture from *depriving* same-sex couples in committed relationships—and their children—of the rights and responsibilities of civil marriage, than from opening civil marriage to them. Amici cannot imagine a more vivid illustration of this than Petitioners April DeBoer and Jayne Rowse, two nurses who seek to marry so that they may jointly adopt the three children they have brought into their family, each of whom had been born into an environment that presented special challenges, including prenatal drug abuse. Ending the exclusion of this family from civil marriage, and from the joint adoption opportunity attendant to it, would

ensure that each of these three children could have two legal parents rather than one, and that both parents could make critical decisions related to the health and welfare of their children. Rather than reinforce this bond between marriage and child-rearing—and the bond between this couple and the children they have committed to raise—Michigan's exclusionary law sunders it, to the detriment of both this family and the institution of civil marriage.

Child Welfare. If there were any persuasive evidence that the civil marriages of same-sex couples were detrimental to children, amici would give it great weight. But there is not. As amici have come to recognize, and as this Court made clear in *Windsor*, child welfare is imperiled, not advanced, by excluding same-sex parents raising children from civil marriage.

First and foremost, legally differentiating their parents "humiliates" those children now being raised by same-sex couples. *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694. In addition, governmental bans on civil marriage rights for same-sex couples threaten their children's financial security and the stability of their entire families. *See, e.g.*, *DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 764 (finding that "children being raised by same-sex couples have only one legal parent and are at risk of being placed in 'legal limbo' if that parent dies or is incapacitated. Denying same-sex couples the ability to marry therefore has a manifestly harmful and destabilizing effect on such couples' children."); *see also Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694-2695 (relying upon a law's "financial harm to children of same-sex couples" and placement of "same-sex couples in an unstable position" in declaring the law unconstitutional). Rather than disagree, the court of appeals in these cases further enumerated harms, writing that the marriage bans at issue "deprive[]

[same-sex couples] of benefits that range from the pro-profound (the right to visit someone in a hospital as a spouse or parent) to the mundane (the right to file joint tax returns). These harms affect not only gay couples but also their children." *DeBoer* v. *Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388, 407-408 (6th Cir. 2014).

In contrast to the clear evidence of harm to children from laws excluding same-sex couples from civil marriage, there is no grounding in facts or reality to conclude that such exclusion supports or furthers the interests of children. Social scientists have resoundingly rejected the claim that children raised by same-sex parents fare worse than children raised by other couples. Empirical research "gathered during several decades" shows "no systemic difference" between the child-rearing capabilities of same-sex and heterosexual parents, but rather that the sexual orientation of a child's parent has no measurable effect on the child's well-being. Perrin et al., *Technical Report: Coparent or Second-Parent Adoption by Same-Sex Parents*, 109 Pediatrics 341, 343 (2002) (finding no differences regarding "emotional health, parenting skills, and attitude towards parenting" between same-sex and other parents, and finding that "[n]o data have pointed to any risk to children as a result of growing up in a family with 1 or more gay parents"); *see also* Farr et al., *Parenting and Child Development in Adoptive Families: Does Parental Sexual Orientation Matter?*, 14 Applied Developmental Sci. 164, 175 (2010) (finding children adopted by same-sex parents to be "as well adjusted as those adopted by heterosexual parents" and that there were "no significant differences" between same-sex and heterosexual parents "in terms of child adjustment,

parenting behaviors, or couples' adjustment").[8] The court of appeals in these cases readily agreed: "[G]ay couples, no less than straight couples, are capable of raising children and providing stable families for them. The quality of such relationships, and the capacity to raise children within them, turns not on sexual orientation but on individual choices and individual commitment." *DeBoer*, 772 F.3d at 405.

Scientific conclusions about the lack of harm to children raised in same-sex households have only been further vindicated. For instance, recent longitudinal studies of households with same-sex parents have found that the children of these families fared as well as their peers with heterosexual parents on measures of psychological well-being.[9] In the adoption context, a 2013 study of children adopted into families with same-sex and opposite-sex parents found that "[c]hildren's adjustment outcomes did not differ by family type."[10] And a 2012 study found that high-risk children adopted

---

[8] Courts that have examined the evidence have unanimously agreed. *See, e.g.*, *DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 768; *Hamby*, 2014 WL 5089399, at *11 & n.99; *Perry*, 704 F. Supp. 2d at 980. Assertions to the contrary have been exposed as unsupported, biased, or both. *See, e.g.*, *DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 766-768 (explaining how Michigan relied upon a study "hastily concocted at the behest of a third-party funder ... [who] clearly wanted a certain result and [the study's author] obliged," as well as studies that were methodologically unsound).

[9] *E.g.*, van Gelderen et al., *Quality of Life of Adolescents Raised From Birth by Lesbian Mothers: The US National Longitudinal Family Study*, 33 J. Developmental & Behav. Pediatrics 17 (2012).

[10] Goldberg & Smith, *Predictors of Psychological Adjustment in Early Placed Adopted Children With Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Parents*, 27 J. Family Psychol. 431, 431 (2013).

from foster care did at least equally well whether adopted by opposite-sex or same-sex parents, "despite gay and lesbian parents raising children with higher levels of biological and environmental risks prior to adoptive placement."[11]

Biology. There is also no biological justification for denying civil marriage to same-sex couples. Allowing same-sex couples to marry in no way undermines the importance of marriage for opposite-sex couples who enter into marriage to provide a stable family structure for their children. Indeed, there is no evidence that marriage between individuals of the same sex affects opposite-sex couples' decisions about procreation, marriage, divorce, or parenting whatsoever. *Cf. Windsor* v. *United States*, 699 F.3d 169, 188 (2d Cir. 2012) (laws burdening same-sex couples' right to civil marriage "do[] not provide any incremental reason for opposite-sex couples to engage in 'responsible procreation'"), *aff'd*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013).

Moreover, our society has long recognized that civil marriage also protects and benefits couples who are unable, or who choose not, to bear children. Many married couples adopt children and thus value the child-protective institution of marriage. Others marry after child-bearing age but still benefit from the web of rights and obligations conferred by marriage. In particular, marriage facilitates the opportunity and ability of members of couples to support each other, as well as their vulnerable relatives and fellow community members of any age, and thereby to avoid reliance upon government assistance and intervention. *See Windsor*,

---

[11] Lavner et al., *Can Gay and Lesbian Parents Promote Healthy Development in High-Risk Children Adopted From Foster Care?*, 82 Am. J. Orthopsychiatry 465, 465 (2012).

133 S. Ct. at 2695 (noting that "it is expected that spouses will support each other" as "an essential part of married life"); Choper & Yoo, *supra*, at 33-34. Whatever the merits behind the speculation that marriage was originally fashioned only to channel the procreative impulse, it has been centuries since marriage was so limited (if it ever was). Our Nation's first President and his wife had no children together, but their marriage provided a protective family structure for raising Martha Washington's children by her first marriage as well as her grandchildren, and for the President and Martha Washington themselves. *See* Chernow, *Washington: A Life* 78-83, 421-422 (2010).

In the present day, hundreds of thousands of children are *in fact* being raised in loving families with parents of the same sex. The last few decades have demonstrated that many same-sex couples strongly wish to raise children and are doing so; this is a social development that will not be reversed, but will likely only accelerate. Because amici believe that having married parents is optimal for children, they conclude that granting the rights and responsibilities of civil marriage and its recognition to same-sex couples will protect, not harm, their children, as well as the many children who will be raised by same-sex couples in the future. And these children are no less deserving than others of those protections. Indeed, it is amici's "fervent hope that these children will grow up 'to understand the integrity and closeness of their own family and its concord with other families in their community and in their daily lives.'" *DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 775 (quoting *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694).

B. Even If The Marriage Bans Were Based On Concerns For Tradition And Caution In The Face Of Societal Change, That Does Not Sustain Their Constitutionality

That governments may have long treated same-sex couples differently from opposite-sex couples where civil marriage is concerned does not by itself provide a permissible justification for discriminatory laws like the marriage bans at issue here. The rule that a classification must find support in a legitimate factual justification—not simply in its historical pedigree—is central to our constitutional tradition.

This Court's gender discrimination cases, in particular, make clear that formerly widespread traditional views alone cannot justify a discriminatory law under even the most permissive standard of review. *Stanton* v. *Stanton*, 421 U.S. 7, 14-15 (1975) ("old notions" and "role-typing" did not supply a rational basis for classification); *see also Craig* v. *Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 198-199 (1976) (rejecting "increasingly outdated misconceptions" as "loose-fitting characterizations incapable of supporting state statutory schemes that were premised upon their accuracy"). This Court has not hesitated to reconsider a law's outmoded justifications and, where appropriate, to deem them insufficient to survive an equal protection challenge. *See, e.g.*, *Trammel* v. *United States*, 445 U.S. 40, 52 (1980) (rejecting basis for law discriminating based on sex because its "ancient foundations ... have long since disappeared" as "[c]hip by chip, over the years those archaic notions [of women's roles] have been cast aside"); *Taylor* v. *Louisiana*, 419 U.S. 522, 537 (1975) ("If it was ever the case that women were unqualified to sit on juries or were so situated that none of them should be required to perform jury service, that time

has long since passed."). The governmental bans at issue here rest on similarly ungrounded, archaic, and obsolete beliefs—however sincerely, strongly, or long held—and thus the Fourteenth Amendment requires recognition of the bans' invalidity.

This Court has long made clear that, when personal liberty is at stake, the Constitution cannot continue to enshrine previously unexamined societal assumptions once new facts and information come to light. *See Palmore* v. *Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429, 434 (1984) (reversing court of appeals' decision that a child could be removed from the mother's custody because the mother had entered into an interracial marriage); *Brown* v. *Board of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483, 492-494 (1954) ("[W]e cannot turn the clock back to ... 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written .... Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding [that racial segregation denotes inferiority] is amply supported by modern authority.").

Courts in cases like these have thus rejected the bare invocation of tradition as a sufficient rational basis for precluding same-sex couples from access to civil marriage. *See DeBoer*, 973 F. Supp. 2d at 772 (""The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now""); *Bourke*, 996 F. Supp. 2d at 552 (holding that tradition cannot alone justify infringement of individual liberties); *Golinski*, 824 F. Supp. 2d at 998 ("[T]he argument that the definition of marriage should remain the same for the definition's sake is a circular argument, not a rational justification."); *Perry*, 704 F. Supp. 2d at 998 ("[T]he state must have an interest apart from the fact of the tradition itself.").

Although amici firmly believe that beneficial institutions like marriage should not be changed lightly, embracing marriage for same-sex couples would not change the institution of marriage; it would strengthen that institution. Moreover, amici do not believe that courts are bound to disregard facts when considering outmoded and injurious laws that stand against any rectifying change. *See* 2 Burke, *The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke* 295 (Bell ed. 1892) ("A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."). Our Nation has undergone too many changes for the better already—especially in its repudiation of discrimination against minorities—to allow social policy to be dictated by unexamined hypotheses undermined by evidence. Thus, a law cannot be sustained when it no longer reflects the "realities of the subject" that law addresses. *Heller*, 509 U.S. at 321; *see also id.* at 326 ("Ancient lineage of a legal concept does not give it immunity from attack for lacking a rational basis."); *Williams* v. *Illinois*, 399 U.S. 235, 239 (1970) ("[N]either the antiquity of a practice nor the fact of steadfast legislative and judicial adherence to it through the centuries insulates it from constitutional attack[.]"). It is the traditional values served by civil marriage—responsibility, fidelity, commitment, and stability, among others—that amici believe justify its equal availability under law. Those values would be served by *ending* governmental exclusion of same-sex couples from the institution of civil marriage, not by perpetuating it.[12]

---

[12] To be sure, some Americans hold deep-seated religious objections to same-sex couples marrying. But amici do not believe that civil marriage rights can or need be withheld from same-sex couples for fear that the religious freedom of the faithful will be

Thus, amici view the court of appeals' invocations of "[a] Burkean sense of caution" and a "wait-and-see approach," *DeBoer*, 772 F.3d at 406, 409, as misplaced. The laws at issue here are anything but cautious, as they enact permanent government exclusions of same-sex couples from civil marriage—exclusions that are, in many instances, enshrined against ordinary legislative revision. That very lack of caution is made clear by the fact that none of the governments has grounded its purported caution in anything more than speculation that unspecified adverse consequences could result. This Court does not treat caution, by itself, as a sufficient justification to deny individuals equal access to fundamental rights. *See, e.g.*, *Watson* v. *City of Memphis*, 373 U.S. 526, 535-536 (1963) (rejecting a government's purported interest in proceeding with "gradual" change); *Hunter* v. *Erickson*, 393 U.S. 385, 392 (1969) (rejecting a government "decision to move slowly in the delicate area"). And, as governments "can plead an interest in proceeding with caution in almost any setting," *Kitchen* v. *Herbert*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 1181, 1213 (D. Utah 2013), treating such an interest as sufficient to sustain otherwise discriminatory laws would render this Court's review a nullity. Such a result is untenable; as this Court recently confirmed, even a government's desire to avail itself of the benefit of State-by-State experimentation "may not deny the

---

infringed. As discussed *supra* note 3, the First Amendment and analogous State laws provide ample protection for expressions of diverging views on the subject. And amici see no reason why a decision from this Court holding that the Fourteenth Amendment requires State governments to solemnize and recognize marriages between same-sex couples should in any way prejudice the rights of the faithful to voice their opinions on the subject, nor require them to participate in or otherwise endorse civil marriages for same-sex couples based on their sincerely held religious beliefs.

basic dignity the Constitution protects." *Hall* v. *Flori-Florida*, 134 S. Ct. 1986, 2001 (2014). Indeed, "the enshrinement of constitutional rights necessarily takes certain policy choices off the table." *District of Columbia* v. *Heller*, 554 U.S. 570, 636 (2008). The choice to enact a law that deprives committed same-sex couples and their children of the rights and responsibilities of civil marriage is one of those.

III. This Court Should Ensure That Governments Do Not Deny The Rights And Responsibilities Of Civil Marriage To Same-Sex Couples

Amici recognize the admirable commitment of our judiciary to exercise restraint when confronted with a provision duly enacted by the people or their representatives. But "deference does not imply abandonment or abdication of judicial review." *Miller-El* v. *Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 340 (2003). State governments do not have "unfettered discretion to define the full scope of the constitutional protection" in cases concerning individual rights and dignity. *Hall*, 134 S. Ct. at 1998. Instead, it is the courts' role to set aside laws that overstep the limits imposed by the Constitution—these limits reflect a different kind of restraint, which the people wisely imposed to protect segments of the population from deprivation of their liberties without a legitimate basis. As Madison put it,

> In our Governments the real power lies in the majority of the Community, and the invasion of private rights is *chiefly* to be apprehended, not from acts of Government contrary to the sense of its constituents, but from acts in which the Government is the mere instrument of the major number of the Constituents.

5 *The Writings of James Madison: 1787-1790*, at 272 (Hunt ed., 1904). Likewise, while it is the duty of the political branches of government "in the first and primary instance" "to preserve and protect the Constitution," the judiciary must not "admit inability to intervene when one or the other level of Government has tipped the scales too far." *United States* v. *Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 577-578 (1995) (Kennedy, J., concurring).

This Court has repeatedly made clear that although legislators and voters may generally exercise power over certain subjects—including many contentious social issues—the government's power is limited when it comes to injurious incursions upon the freedom of minorities. *See, e.g.*, *Schuette* v. *Coalition To Defend Affirmative Action*, 134 S. Ct. 1623, 1636-1637 (2014) (plurality opinion) (emphasizing that the Constitution requires redress by the courts when "the encouragement or command of laws or other state action" inflicts "hurt or injury" on minorities); *Lucas* v. *Forty-Fourth Gen. Assembly of Colo.*, 377 U.S. 713, 736-737 (1964) ("A citizen's constitutional rights can hardly be infringed simply because a majority of the people choose that it be."). The court of appeals mistook this Court's teachings for a mandate to refrain from judgment even where it is individuals and their freedoms, not the democratic process, that are being "demean[ed]." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694 (placing "same-sex couples in an unstable position" and treating their relationships as "second-tier" is a "differentiation [that] demeans the couple"); *see DeBoer*, 772 F.3d at 409 (quoting *Schuette*, 134 S. Ct. at 1637).

It is accordingly not a violation of principles of judicial restraint for this Court to strike down laws that infringe "fundamental rights necessary to our system of ordered liberty," *McDonald* v. *City of Chicago*, 561

U.S. 742, 778 (2010), particularly where they inflict "re-"real and specific injury," *Schuette*, 134 S. Ct. at 1631, 1636-1638. It is instead a key protection of limited, constitutionally constrained government. *See* Federalist No. 78, at 524 (Hamilton) (Cooke ed., 1961) ("[A] limited constitution ... can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice; whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the constitution void."); *see also* Madison, Speech in Congress on the Removal Power (June 8, 1789), in 1 *Annals of Cong.* 448, 457 (Gales ed., 1790) ("[I]ndependent tribunals ... will be an impenetrable bulwark against every assumption of power in the legislative or executive; they will be naturally led to resist every encroachment upon rights expressly stipulated for in the constitution[.]").

The right to marry indisputably falls within the narrow band of specially protected liberties that this Court ensures are protected from unwarranted curtailment. This Court's special solicitude for marriage is manifest in its decision in *Loving*. There, this Court held a State ban on interracial marriage invalid under the Fourteenth Amendment, rejecting arguments that the Court should not address an issue of exclusively State concern and that social science evidence demonstrated that interracial marriage harmed children, led to higher divorce rates, and weakened the marital bond. *See* Appellee Br., *Loving*, 388 U.S. 1 (No. 66-395).[13]

---

[13] This Court struck down Virginia's ban on interracial marriage in *Loving* even though States were actively debating whether to repeal or to continue enforcing such laws. 388 U.S. at 6 & n.5; *see also id.* at 7-8. This Court's action did not improperly short-

The bans at issue here have run afoul of our constitutional order by submitting a fundamental right to legislative or popular referendum. *See City of Cleburne* v. *Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 448 (1985) ("It is plain that the electorate as a whole, whether by referendum or otherwise, could not order [government] action violative of the Equal Protection Clause, and the [government] may not avoid the strictures of that Clause by deferring to the wishes or objections of some fraction of the body politic." (citation omitted)); *see also West Virginia State Bd. of Educ.* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943) ("The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, ... and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."). These cases accordingly present one of the rare instances in which judicial action is necessary to prevent overreaching by the electorate. When fundamental liberties are at stake, personal "choices and assessments ... are not for the Government to make," *Citizens United* v. *FEC*, 558 U.S. 310, 372 (2010), and courts must step in to prevent any encroachment upon individual rights.

Our constitutional guarantees of freedom are no less a part of our legal traditions than is the salutary principle of judicial restraint, and this Court honors those traditions—as well as conservative principles—

---

circuit ongoing democratic developments in the sixteen States that prohibited interracial marriage at the time, but rather fulfilled this Court's responsibility to enforce the constitutional guarantee of equal protection.

when it acts to secure constitutionally protected liberliberties against government overreaching. *Cf.* Goldwater, *The Conscience of a Conservative* 13-14 (1960) ("The Conservative is the first to understand that the practice of freedom requires the establishment of order: it is impossible for one man to be free if another is able to deny him the exercise of his freedom. ... He knows that the utmost vigilance and care are required to keep political power within its proper bounds.").

Thus, this Court has invalidated laws infringing the Second Amendment right to self-defense and to bear arms. *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 635. It has protected the right of all to participate in public debate on issues of public concern. *See First Nat'l Bank of Boston* v. *Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765 (1978); *Buckley* v. *Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976); *New York Times* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964). It has voided application of a State law that interfered with the fundamental "'liberty of parents ... to direct the upbringing and education of children.'" *Wisconsin* v. *Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 233 (1972). It has protected the rights of religious groups to assemble in and use public facilities. *See Lamb's Chapel* v. *Center Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.*, 508 U.S. 384, 395-397 (1993); *Widmar* v. *Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263, 276-277 (1981). And two years ago, this Court reaffirmed that "State laws defining and regulating marriage, of course, must respect the constitutional rights of persons." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2691 (citing *Loving*). Our society is more free because the Court has exercised its power and duty to enforce and support the Constitution in such a manner. The Court should do so again in these cases.

CONCLUSION

The judgment of the court of appeals should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted.

SEAN R. GALLAGHER
STACY A. CARPENTER
BENNETT L. COHEN
POLSINELLI PC
1515 Wynkoop Street
Suite 600
Denver, CO 80202

MARK C. FLEMING
FELICIA H. ELLSWORTH
ELISABETH M. OPPENHEIMER
ALLISON TRZOP
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

ALAN E. SCHOENFELD
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007

REGINALD J. BROWN
SETH P. WAXMAN
Counsel of Record
PAUL R.Q. WOLFSON
DINA B. MISHRA
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000
seth.waxman@wilmerhale.com

MARCH 2015

APPENDIX

LIST OF AMICI CURIAE

Kenneth B. Mehlman, Chairman, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007

Daniel J. Acciavatti, Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, 32nd District, 2003-2008

Abe Adams, Deputy Digital Director, Romney-Ryan 2012

Tim Adams, Undersecretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, 2005-2007

Sarah Anderson, Communications and Research Director for the Michigan Republican Party, 2005-2007

Todd Anderson, Chief of Staff to the Republican Speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives, 2001-2004

Gregory T. Angelo, Executive Director, Log Cabin Republicans

Cliff S. Asness, Businessman, Philanthropist, and Author

David D. Aufhauser, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, 2001-2003

Joshua Baca, National Coalitions Director, Romney for President 2012, and Former Congressional Staff Member to Representative Heather Wilson

Doug Badger, Executive Director, Oregon Bush-Cheney 2004, and Chief of Staff, U.S. Congresswoman Jennifer Dunn

John Bailey, Policy Director, Bush-Cheney 2004, and Special Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, 2007-2009

Charlie Baker, Governor of Massachusetts, 2015-Present

Melissa Hall Davis Balough, Energy and Environment Policy Director, Romney for President, 2007-2008

Lyn Bankes, Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, 19th District, 1985-1998

William E. "Bill" Baroni, Jr., New Jersey State Assemblyman, 2004-2008, New Jersey State Senator, 2008-2010, and Of Counsel at Hill Wallack LLP

Michael James Barton, Deputy Director of the Middle East Policy Office, Pentagon, 2006-2009, and Homeland Security Council Member, White House, 2003-2006

Charles Bass, Member of Congress, 1995-2007 and 2011-2013

Glynda A. Becker, Associate Director, White House Office of Political Affairs, 2003-2006, and Environmental and Energy Specialist, U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002-2003

Rich Beeson, Political Director, Romney for President, 2011-2012, Political Director, Republican National Committee, 2007-2008

John B. Bellinger III, Legal Adviser to the Department of State, 2005-2009

Troy Benavidez, Presidential Advisory Council on HIV AIDs, 2006-2009

Crystal Benton, Former Press Secretary to Senator John McCain and Deputy Communications Director for John McCain for President, 2008

Juliana Bergeron, New Hampshire Republican National Committeewoman, 2012-Present

Elliot S. Berke, Counsel, Office of the Speaker, 2006, General Counsel, Office of the Majority Leader, 2004-2006, and Special Counsel, U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development, 2002-2004

Jeff Berkowitz, Research Director, Republican National Committee, 2009-2010, and White House Associate Director of Scheduling-Research, 2005-2006

Jon Berrier, Communications and Political Affairs Coordinator, The White House, Office of the Vice President, 2005-2006

Michael Beylkin, Attorney at Law, Colorado

Katie Biber, General Counsel, Romney for President, 2007-2008 and 2011-2012

David E. Black, National Finance Team, Huntsman for President, 2011-2012, and Press Advance Lead, Romney for President, 2012

Dan G. Blair, Deputy Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2002-2006 (Acting Director, 2005), and Commissioner, Postal Regulatory Commission, 2006-2011 (Chair, 2006-2009)

Dan Blum, Deputy Campaign Manager, Scott Walker for Governor, 2011-2012, and Senior Research Analyst, Republican National Committee, 2007-2009

Mary Bono, Member of Congress, 1998-2013

Tucker Bounds, National Spokesman, John McCain for President, 2008

Pat Brady, Chairman, Illinois GOP, 2009-2013

John M. Bridgeland, Director, White House Domestic Policy Council, 2001-2002, and Assistant to the President and Director, U.S.A. Freedom Corps, 2002-2004

Eric Brinker, Businessman and Philanthropist

Nancy Brinker, Ambassador to Hungary, 2001-2003, and Chief of Protocol for the United States, 2007-2008

Neil R. Brown, Senior Professional Staff Member, Republican Staff, United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2005-2013

Bill Brownson, National Board Chair, Log Cabin Republicans, 2003-2006

Brooks Brunson, Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff, House Republican Conference, 2003-2005

Sean Cairncross, Deputy Executive Director and General Counsel, National Republican Senatorial Committee, 2009-2013, and Chief Counsel, Republican National Committee, 2007-2009

Sally Canfield, Policy Director, Romney for President, 2006-2008, and Deputy Chief of Staff, Senator Marco Rubio, 2011-2015

Alex Castellanos, Republican Media Advisor

Dan Centinello, Deputy National Political Director, Mitt Romney for President, 2011-2012, and Statewide Field Director, Chris Christie for Governor, 2009

David C. Chavern, Business Association Executive

Mary Cheney, Director of Vice Presidential Operations, Bush-Cheney 2004, 2003-2004

Thomas J. Christensen, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, 2006-2008

Jim Cicconi, Assistant to the President and Deputy to the Chief of Staff, 1989-1990

Harry W. Clark, Counselor to Ambassador Robert B. Zoellick and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 2003-2004, and Senior Adviser to the Albright Stonebridge Group

Gus Coldebella, Acting General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2007-2009, and Deputy General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2005-2007

Susan M. Collins, U.S. Senator for Maine, 1997-Present

Jeff Cook-McCormac, Philanthropic and Political Advisor

R. Clarke Cooper, U.S. Alternative Representative, United Nations Security Council, 2007-2009

Mike Cox, Attorney General of Michigan, 2003-2011

Sara Craig, Iowa State Director, Romney for President, 2011-2012, and Virginia State Manager, Romney for President, 2012

Julie Cram, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the White House Office of Public Liaison, 2007-2009

Tom Cross, Illinois State Representative, 1993-2015, and Minority Leader of the Illinois House of Representatives, 2002-2013

S.E. Cupp, Author and Political Commentator

Carlos Curbelo, Member of Congress

Kevin Curran, Associate Director of Presidential Personnel, White House, 2006-2009

John C. Danforth, United States Senator, 1976-1995, and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, 2004-2005

Michael P. Davidson, Bush-Cheney 2004, and Non-Profit CEO, 2008-Present

Michele Davis, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs and Director of Policy Planning, Department of the Treasury, 2006-2009

Tyler Deaton, National Committeeman, New Hampshire Young Republicans, 2011-Present

Vincent DeVito, General Counsel, Massachusetts Republican Party, 2007-2013, Chief Legal Counsel, The Baker Committee, 2013-2014, and Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs (Acting)

Bob Dold, Member of Congress, 2011-2013 and 2015-Present

Ben Domenech, Publisher of The Federalist, and Speechwriter for Secretary Tommy Thompson, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2003-2004

Alicia Davis Downs, Associate Political Director, White House, 2001-2003

David Doyle, Chairman, Michigan Republican Party, 1991-1995

James C. Dozier, Republican Political Strategist and Advisor

Leon Drolet, Member of Michigan House of Representatives, 2001-2006

Kenneth M. Duberstein, White House Chief of Staff, 1987-1989, and Assistant to the President, 1981-1984

Christine Dudley, Executive Director, Illinois Republican Party, 1993-1999, Regional Political Director, Republican National Committee, 1999-2002, and Political, Public, and Government Affairs Consultant, 2002-2014

Sean Duffy, Deputy Chief of Staff for Communications, Colorado Governor Bill Owens, 2001-2005

Janet L. Duprey, New York State Assemblywoman, 2007-Present

Christian J. Edwards, Special Assistant to the President and Director of Press Advance, 2005-2007

Mark J. Ellis, State Chairman, Maine Republican Party, 2005-2006 and 2007-2009

Jamie Ensley, Chairman of the Board, Log Cabin Republicans, 2015-Present

Rob Epplin, Legislative Director, U.S. Senator Susan Collins, 2008-2012, and U.S. Senator Gordon Smith, 1997-2008

Cary Evans, Senior Field Advisor, Rudy Giuliani for President, 2007-2008, Regional Political Director, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007, and Regional Political Director, Bush-Cheney 2004, 2003-2004

Elizabeth Noyer Feld, Public Affairs Specialist, White House Office of Management and Budget, 1984-1986, and Assistant to the Press Secretary for Vice President George H. W. Bush, 1986-1987

Mason Fink, Finance Director, Romney for President, 2012

Kirk Fordham, Republican Congressional Chief of Staff, 1995-2006

Carl Forti, Deputy Campaign Manager and Political Director, Romney for President 2007-2008

Jill Hazelbaker Franks, Communications Director, John McCain for President, 2007-2008

Edward J. Gaffney, Jr., Esquire, Member of Michigan House of Representatives, 2002-2008

Kathryn E. Gage, Deputy Campaign Manager, Romney for President 2012

Reed Galen, Director of Scheduling and Advance, Bush-Cheney 2004, 2003-2004

Richard Galen, Communications Director, Speaker's Political Office, 1996-1997

Jenny Gaynor, Deputy Chief of Staff, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007, and Director of Correspondence, Bush-Cheney 2004

William C. T. Gaynor II, Associate Director Office of Business Liaison, Department of Commerce, 2001-2003, and Western Regional Finance Director, Bush-Cheney 2004

Mark Gerson, Chairman, Gerson Lehrman Group and Author of *The Neoconservative Vision: From the Cold War to the Culture Wars* and *In the Classroom: Dispatches from an Inner-City School that Works*

Chris Gibson, Member of Congress, 2011-Present

Josh Ginsberg, National Field Director, Romney for President, 2007-2008

Rudolph W. Giuliani, Mayor of the City of New York, 1994-2001, United States Attorney, Southern District of New York, 1983-1989, and Associate Attorney General of the United States, 1981-1983

James K. Glassman, Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, 2008-2009

Chris Gober, Deputy Counsel, Republican National Committee, 2006-2007, and General Counsel, National Republican Senatorial Committee, 2007-2008

Patricia Godchaux, Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, 40th District, 1997-2002

Gabriel E. Gomez, U.S. Senate Candidate, 2013

John Goodwin, Chief of Staff to Raul Labrador, Member of Congress, 2011-2013

Adam Gordon, Former Deputy District Attorney, San Diego County District Attorney's Office, 2009-2014

Jennifer Gratz, Founder, XIV Foundation, and Executive Director, Michigan Civil Rights Initiative

Adrian Gray, Director of Strategy, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007

Richard Grenell, Spokesman, U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, 2001-2008

Susan Grimes Gilbert, Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, 1987-1996

Mark Grisanti, New York State Senator, 2011-2014

Joseph A. Grundfest, Commissioner, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 1985-1990

Patrick Guerriero, Mayor of Melrose, Massachusetts, and Member of Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1993-2001

Chris Gulugian-Taylor, Director, Gubernatorial Campaigns and Statewide Organizations, Targeted Victory, 2011-Present

Carlos Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce, 2005-2009

Stephen Hadley, Assistant to the President and National Security Advisor, 2005-2009

Brian Haley, Deputy Finance Director, John McCain for President, 2008, and Finance Director, Tim Pawlenty for President, 2012

Richard L. Hanna, Member of Congress, 2011-Present

Jon Henke, New Media Advisor, Senate Republican Leadership Communications Office, 2007

Jerri Ann Henry, Campaign Manager, Young Conservatives for the Freedom to Marry, 2015

Israel Hernandez, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, 2005-2009

David G. Herro, Businessman and Philanthropist

Dawson Hodgson, Member, Rhode Island Senate, 2011-2015

Rachel Hoff, Director of Defense Analysis, American Action Forum, 2015, and D.C. National Committeewoman, Young Republicans, 2006-2009

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director, Congressional Budget Office, 2003-2005

Dave Honigman, Former Member of the Michigan Senate, and Former Member of the Michigan House of Representatives

Margaret Hoover, Advisor to the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, 2005-2006

Michael Huffington, Member of Congress, 1993-1995

Abby Huntsman, Political Commentator

Jon Huntsman, Governor of Utah, 2005-2009, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, 1989-1992, U.S. Ambassador to Singapore, 1992-1993, U.S. Trade Ambassador, 2001-2003, and U.S. Ambassador to China, 2009-2011

Bob Inglis, U.S. Representative, South Carolina, 1993-1999 and 2005-2011

Susan Jandernoa, Board Member Appointee, State of Michigan Health Endowment

Michael Jandernoa, Board Member, Business Leaders for Michigan

David A. Javdan, General Counsel, U.S. Small Business Administration, 2002-2006

Reuben Jeffery, Undersecretary of State for Economic, Energy, and Agricultural Affairs, 2007-2009

Coddy Johnson, National Field Director, Bush-Cheney 2004, White House Office of Political Affairs, and Regional Director Bush-Cheney 2000

Gary Johnson, Governor of New Mexico, 1995-2003, and Libertarian Party Nominee for President, 2012

Nancy L. Johnson, Member of Congress, 1983-2007

Rick Johnson, Former Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, and Former Speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives, 2001-2004

Brian Jones, Senior Advisor, Romney for President, 2012, and Communications Director, McCain for President, 2008

Brian W. Jones, General Counsel, U.S. Department of Education, 2001-2005

Jennifer Jones, Republican Strategist

Elise Jordan, Director for Communications, National Security Council, 2007-2008

Robert Kabel, Special Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs, 1982-1985

Neel Kashkari, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, 2008-2009, and Republican Nominee for Governor of California, 2014

Theodore W. Kassinger, Deputy Secretary of Commerce, 2004-2005, and General Counsel of the Commerce Department, 2001-2004

Ron Kaufman, Senior Advisor, Romney for President, 2012, and Assistant to the President for Political Affairs and White House Political Director for President George H. W. Bush

Jason Kauppi, Press Secretary, Office of the Governor of Massachusetts, 2001

Loren Kaye, Deputy Cabinet Secretary, Governor George Deukmejian, 1986-1991, and Cabinet Secretary and Trade and Commerce Under Secretary, Governor Pete Wilson, 1991-1996

Chrysovalantis Kefalas, Deputy Counsel to Governor Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., 2004-2007

Mark Steven Kirk, U.S. Senator for Illinois, 2010-Present, and U.S. Representative to Congress for Illinois, 10th District, 2001-2010

Jonathan Kislak, Deputy Undersecretary of Agriculture for Small Community and Rural Development, 1989-1991

David H. Koch, Philanthropist

Jim Kolbe, Member of Congress, 1985-2007

Jeffrey Kupfer, Chief of Staff and Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy, 2006-2009

Ed Kutler, Assistant to the Speaker of the House, 1995-1997

Wade Lairsen, Associate Director, White House Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, 2007-2008

David Langdon, Special Assistant to the Chairman, Republican National Committee, 2004-2007, and Special Assistant to the Governor, Romney for President 2008

James C. Langdon III, Office of the Chief of Staff, Executive Assistant to both Special Assistants to the President for Policy, 2005-2007

Kory A. Langhofer, Associate Counsel, Romney for President, 2012, and Assistant United States Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, 2009-2011

Steven C. LaTourette, U.S. Representative, 1995-2013

Frank Lavin, Undersecretary of Commerce for International Trade, 2005-2007, U.S. Ambassador to Singapore, 2001-2005, and Director, White House Office of Political Affairs, 1987-1989

Rick Lazio, Member of Congress, 1993-2001

Rek LeCounte, Young Conservative Leadership Committee, 2014-Present

Simone Ledeen, Defense Fellow, 2004-2009

Kathryn Lehman, Chief of Staff, House Republican Conference, 2003-2005

Eli Lehrer, Speechwriter to Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, 2004-2007

Andrew J.P. Levy, Deputy General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006-2009

Joseph J. Lhota, Republican Nominee for Mayor, The City of New York, 2013

Mathew L. Lira, Republican Strategist

Thomas A. Little, Vermont State Representative, 1992-2002 and Chairman of the Vermont House Judiciary Committee, 1999-2000

Daniel S. Loeb, Investor and Philanthropist

Sarah Longwell, Vice-Chair, Log Cabin Republicans, 2011-Present

Eduardo J. Lopez-Reyes, National Vice Chairman of the Republican Liberty Caucus, 2011-Present

Richard N. Lorenc, Chief Operating Officer, Foundation for Economic Education, 2013-Present

Alex Lundry, Director of Data Science, Romney for President, 2012

Paul Makarechian, Bush-Cheney 2004, and Business Executive

Liz Mair, Online Communications Director and Spokeswoman, Republican National Committee, 2008, and Online Communications Strategist for Carly Fiorina, Rick Perry, Scott Walker, and Rand Paul

Christopher Maloney, Ohio Communications Director and Spokesman, Romney for President, 2012

Adele Malpass, Chairwoman of Manhattan Republican Party

Dana Edwards Manatos, Associate Director of Public Liaison, White House, 2005-2007

N. Gregory Mankiw, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, 2003-2005

Catherine Martin, Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Communications Director for Policy and Planning, 2005-2007

Kevin Martin, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, 2005-2009

Meghan McCain, Political Commentator

Lauren McCann, Board Member, Young Conservatives for the Freedom to Marry, 2015

Stanley A. McChrystal, Four-Star General, United States Army, 1976-2010

David McCormick, Undersecretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, 2007-2009

Brent McGoldrick, Director of Advertising Analytics, Romney for President 2012

Michael McHugh, Legislative Staff, Senator Gordon Smith, 2006-2008, and Political Consultant

Mark McKinnon, Former Chief Media Advisor to President George W. Bush and Leading Reform Advocate

Aaron McLear, Press Secretary to Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, 2007-2011

Richard D. McLellan, Political Strategist and Policy Advisor

T. Vance McMahan, U.S. Ambassador, United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2008-2009

Greg McNeilly, Executive Director, Michigan Republican Party, 2003-2005

Joe Megyesy, Communications Director, Congressman Mike Coffman, 2011-2012, and Press Secretary, Colorado Senate Republicans, 2006-2009

Bruce P. Mehlman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, 2001-2003

J. Frank Mermoud, Special Representative for Commercial and Business Affairs, U.S. Department of State, 2002-2009

Dan Meyers, Republican National Committee, 2006

William Milliken, Governor of Michigan, 1969-1983

Zac Moffatt, Digital Director, Romney for President 2012, and Political Education Director, Republican National Committee, 2007-2008

Keith Molin, Former Director Michigan Department of Labor, 1975-1977, and Former Director Michigan Department of Commerce, 1977-1979

Susan Molinari, Member of Congress, 1990-1997

Connie Morella, Member of Congress, 1987-2003, and U.S. Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2003-2007

James L. Morgan III, Deputy Political Director, Republican National Committee, 1988-89, Deputy Political Director, Bush for President, 1987-1988, and Executive Director, Georgia Republican Party, 1984-1986

Andrew Moylan, Executive Director, R Street Institute, 2012-Present

Michael E. Murphy, Republican Political Consultant

James Murray, Deputy Chief of Staff to Michigan Speaker Rick Johnson, 1990-2005

Beth Myers, Romney for President Campaign Manager, 2007-2008 and Senior Advisor, 2011-2012

David Karl Myers, Vice-Chair of the Howard County Republican Party in Maryland, and Alternate Delegate to the Republican National Party, 2012

Michael Napolitano, White House Office of Political Affairs, 2001-2003

Jennifer A. Nassour, Chair, Conservative Women for a Better Future, 2011-Present, and Chair, Massachusetts Republican Party, 2009-2011

Ana Navarro, National Hispanic Co-Chair, John McCain for President, 2008

Susan Neely, Special Assistant to the President, 2001-2002, and Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2003-2005

Nicole Neily, Board Member, Alumni for Liberty

Jill E. Neunaber, Iowa State Director, Romney for President, 2012

Noam Neusner, Special Assistant to the President for Economic Speechwriting, 2002-2005

Mina Nguyen, Deputy Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Treasury, 2006-2007

Cristyne L. Nicholas, Communications Director, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, 1993-1999

Mario Nicolais, Senior Research Analyst, Rudy Giuliani for President, 2007-2008, Republican Commissioner, Colorado Reapportionment Commission, 2011, and Spokesman, Coloradans for Freedom, 2012-2014

B.J. Nikkel, Colorado State Representative, 2009-2013, and Majority Whip, 2011-2013

Marco Nunez, Deputy Regional Political Director for the Western Region, Republican National Committee, and Oregon Field Staff, Bush-Cheney 2004

Robert O'Connor, Staff Director, Committee on Homeland Security, U.S. House of Representatives, 2005-2010

Meghan L. O'Sullivan, Special Assistant to the President, 2004-2007, and National Security Advisor for Iraq and Afghanistan, 2005-2007

Richard W. Painter, Associate Counsel to the President, 2005-2007

Chuck Perricone, Former Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, and Former Speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives, 61st District

Mark J. Perry, Scholar at The American Enterprise Institute, 2009-Present

Ruth Ann Petroff, Wyoming State Representative, 2011-Present

Nancy Mitchell Pfotenhauer, Regulatory Advisor, Romney for President, 2012, Senior Policy Advisor National Spokesperson for John McCain for President 2008, and Chief Economist, George H. W. Bush Council on Competitiveness, 1990-1991

Patrick Phillippi, Office of the Chairman, Republican National Committee, 2002-2003

Alex Pisciarino, Research Analyst, Club for Growth, 2013-Present

Gregg Pitts, Director, White House Travel Office, 2006-2009

Karyn Polito, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, 2015-Present

Sarah Pompei, Communications Director, House of Representatives, Majority Whip's Office, 2011-2012, and Deputy Communications Director, Romney for President, 2012

Marge Byington Potter, Former Chairperson, Kent County Board of Commissioners

Paul W. Potter, Chairman, Kent County Veterans Services Committee, and Former Chairman, City of Grand Rapids Planning Commission

J. Stanley Pottinger, Assistant U.S. Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, 1973-1977

Michael Powell, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, 2001-2005, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, 1997-2005

Larry Pressler, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, 1979-1997, and Member of Congress, 1975-1979

Deborah Pryce, Member of Congress, 1993-2009

John Reagan, New Hampshire State Representative, 2006-2011, and New Hampshire State Senator, 2012-Present

John Field Reichardt, Republican Activist and Businessman

Blain Rethmeier, Special Assistant to the President for Communications, White House, 2006-2007, and Press Secretary, Senate Judiciary Committee, 2005-2006

Thomas M. Reynolds, Member of Congress, 1999-2009

James Richardson, Spokesman for the Republican National Committee, and Spokesman for Governors Haley Barbour and Jon Huntsman

Tom Ridge, Governor of Pennsylvania, 1995-2001, and Secretary of Homeland Security, 2003-2005

Mark A. Robbins, General Counsel, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2001-2006

Kelley Robertson, Chief of Staff, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007

Joseph D. Rodota, Cabinet Secretary and Deputy Chief of Staff, Governor Pete Wilson, 1993-1998

Brian Roehrkasse, Director of Public Affairs, Department of Justice, 2005-2008, and Press Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, 2003-2005

Harvey S. Rosen, Member, Council of Economic Advisers, 2003-2005, and Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, 2005

Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Member of Congress, 1989-Present

Richard J. Ross, Massachusetts State Senator, 2010-Present

Lee Rudofsky, Deputy General Counsel, Romney for President, 2012

Patrick Ruffini, eCampaign Director, Republican National Committee, 2005-2007

Patrick Sammon, President, Log Cabin Republicans, 2006-2009

Matthew T. Sanderson, Republican Campaign Attorney

Andrea Saul, Press Secretary, Romney for President, 2012

Skip Saviano, Member of Illinois House of Representatives, 1993-2013

Teresa R. Sayward, Former New York State Assembly Member, 2003-2012

Corry Schiermeyer, Director for Global Communications, National Security Council, 2005-2007

Stephen E. Schmidt, Deputy Assistant to the President and Counselor to the Vice President, 2004-2006

Adam Schroadter, New Hampshire State Representative, 2010-Present

John J. H. Schwarz, M.D., Member of Congress, 2005-2007

George Scoville III, Independent Consultant

Judith L. Scranton, Member of the Michigan House of Representatives, 66th District, 1997-2002

Joan Secchia, Former Trustee, Aquinas College

Peter Secchia, Former U.S. Ambassador to Italy, and Former National Committeeman, Republican National Committee

Christopher Shays, Member of Congress, 1987-2009

Torrey Shearer, Advisor, American Unity PAC, 2013-Present

Erin Sheley, Former Deputy Director, Federalist Society Faculty Division, 2008-2010

Faryar Shirzad, Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for International Economic Affairs, 2004-2006

Lindsay Shuba, Member, Young Conservatives for the Freedom to Marry, 2015

Tammy Simmons, New Hampshire State Representative

Alan K. Simpson, United States Senator, 1979-1997, and Senate Republican Whip, 1985-1995

Ken Spain, Communications Director, National Republican Congressional Committee, 2009-2010

Robert Steel, Undersecretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance, 2006-2008

Christopher Potter Stewart, General Consultant, Dan Innis for Congress, 2013-2015

Sarah Crawford Stewart, Senior Advisor, Huntsman for President, 2011-2012, and New Hampshire Campaign Manager, Pawlenty for President, 2010-2011

Matt Stolhandske, Senior Research and Teaching Fellow, David Rockefeller Center, Harvard University

Candace L. Straight, Former Co-Chair of New Jersey Republican Party State Committee, 2003-2004

Jane Swift, Governor of Massachusetts, 2001-2003

Jay Timmons, Executive Director, National Republican Senatorial Committee, 2003-2005, and Chief of Staff to the Hon. George Allen, 1991-2003

Richard Tisei, Massachusetts State Senator 1991-2011, and Senate Minority Leader 2007-2011

Michael E. Toner, Chairman and Commissioner, Federal Election Commission, 2002-2007

Frances Fragos Townsend, Homeland Security Advisor to the President, 2004-2008

Bryan N. Tramont, Chief of Staff, Federal Communications Commission, 2003-2005, and Senior Legal Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, 2000-2003

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, 1998-2005

Michael Turk, eCampaign Director for Bush-Cheney 2004, 2003-2004

John Ullyot, Communications Director, U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, 2003-2007

Sally A. Vastola, Executive Director, National Republican Congressional Committee, 2003-2006

Ann M. Veneman, United States Secretary of Agriculture, 2001-2005

Nina Verghese, Former Coalitions Director, Governor Huntsman for President, and Deputy Regional Political Director, Republican National Committee, 2007-2008

Jerry Vorva, J.D., Former Michigan State Representative, 20th District

Alexandra Vuksich, Director of Special Projects, Office of the Governor of California, 1991-1998

Mark Wallace, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Representative for UN Management and Reform, 2006-2008

Nicolle Wallace, Assistant to the President and White House Communications Director, 2005-2008

Chris Ward, Former Majority Floor Leader, Michigan House of Representatives

Michael Wascom, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Governmental Affairs, Department of Transportation, 2004-2005

William F. Weld, Governor of Massachusetts, 1991-1997, and Assistant U.S. Attorney General, Criminal Division, 1986-1988

Richard Westfall, Solicitor General of Colorado, 1996-1999

Meg Whitman, Republican Nominee for Governor of California, 2010

August L. Wolf, Businessman and U.S. Olympian 1984

Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense, 2001-2005, and President of the World Bank Group, 2005-2007

Julie Myers Wood, Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2006-2008

Jay S. Zeidman, Office of Public Liaison, White House 2005-2007

Dan Zwonitzer, Wyoming State Representative, 2005-present